<u>REMARKS</u>

This is a response to the Final Office Action of December 16, 2008. Upon entry of this response, claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to define further the present invention, and claims 22-27 have been added. Thus, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22-27 are now pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Vanbuskirk et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,308,157).

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and additions add no new matter to the instant application. The Applicant respectfully requests that there be reconsideration of the claims in view of the Applicant's remarks and the claim amendments.

<u>Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)</u>

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Vanbuskirk et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and reconsideration of the claims as amended is requested.

<u>With respect to Independent claims 1, 8 and 15</u>

With regard to independent claims 1, 8 and 15 as amended, Applicants assert that the method of *Vanbuskirk et al.* is distinguished from the claimed invention as amended.

According to exemplary embodiments, the present invention relates to addressing the problem that, with voice input, a user does not always know what is the acceptable lexicon (dictionary) and grammar. The present invention resolves this problem with a user interface that visually prompts the user for spoken input by displaying text suggestions. The user interface provides a form having a plurality of fields for user input. Once the user selects a field on the form and provides a voice command that is recognized by the system, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms that are appropriate for input into the selected field. The user then speaks the appropriate one of the recognized terms and the system advances and selects the next field on the form.

Applicant respectfully contends that *Vanbuskirk et al.* discloses a method and system for efficiently and intelligently selecting probable commands according to system events, and thereby, **reducing the number of commands displayed to the user** (column 2, lines 21-25). The reduction of the number of commands displayed to a user is accomplished by intelligently selecting only commands that the user is likely to execute next. Because they are based on a predicted next event, the quantity of selected commands will be much less than that in conventional speech recognition systems. And, the short list of commands, listed in order of the most likely commands, can be easily displayed and viewed by the user (column 2, lines 37-44). Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the teaching of *Vanbuskirk et al.* is fundamentally different than that of the claimed invention.

In particular, the **Applicant respectfully asserts that *Vanbuskirk et al.* does not teach recognizing an input term from the displayed list of recognized input terms and inputting a selected input term into the selected field**. This is defined in claim 1 as "upon receipt of an appropriate recognized input term, the input term is input in the selected field"; in claim 8 as "completing the selected field with the input term if the at least one word is recognized as the input term"; or in claim 15 as "if the at least one word is recognized as an input term, then completing the selected field with the input term".

Applicant respectfully contends that actually teaches away from the claimed invention by suggesting that the objective for the invention of *Vanbuskirk et al.* was to intelligently select probable commands according to system events, and thereby, reduce the number of commands displayed to the user (column 2, lines 21-25). This is fundamentally different than displaying all of the possible input terms for a selected field on a form as now claimed. "A reference may be said to teach away when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant. ... in general, a reference will teach away if it suggests that the line of development flowing from the reference's disclosure is unlikely to be productive of the result sought by the applicant." *In re Gurley*, 2 F.3d 551, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1130, 1131 (Fed Cir. 1994).

Moreover, the claimed invention provides **a form** having a plurality of pull-down menu fields for user input, wherein upon selection of one field and receipt of a recognized command spoken by the user, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms in a pull-down menu that are appropriate for input into the selected field, as claimed. Nothing in *Vanbuskirk et al.* even remotely suggests the use of **a form** having a plurality of pull-down menus for displaying recognized input terms that can be input into a selected field on a form as claimed.

Furthermore, nothing in *Vanbuskirk et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests that **upon receipt of a recognized input term for the selected field, the system automatically selects the next field on the form for user input**. Rather, it appears that after the user has utilized the "what can I say" command, that the program flow displays a graphical user interface dialog window (column 5, lines 33-35) and returns to receive the user inputs. Applicants assert that this is not "automatically selects a next field **on the form** for user input", as now claimed.

Therefore, Applicant maintains that *Vanbuskirk et al.* would not anticipate the claimed invention because the method taught by *Vanbuskirk et al.* does not teach either "**recognizing an input term from the displayed list of recognized input terms and inputting a selected input term into the selected field on the form**" or "**upon receipt of a recognized input term for the selected field, the system automatically selects the next field on the form for user input**", and now claimed. "Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 22-27

Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 22-27, are dependent upon claims 1, 8 and 15, which are believed to be allowable over the prior art made of record. Therefore, these claims are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

For example, new claims 22, 24 and 26, recite wherein the list of recognized input terms comprises all possible input terms for the selected field. In the system taught by *Vanbuskirk et al.*, the selecting of probable commands is according to system events, and thereby, reduces the

number of commands displayed to the user (column 2, lines 21-25). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the teaching of *Vanbuskirk et al.* is fundamentally different than that of the claimed invention.

In addition, new claims 23, 25 and 27, recite wherein the list of recognized input terms is defined in the user interface. The Applicant asserts that they can find no such teaching in *Vanbuskirk et al.* of where the list of recognized input terms is defined.

Other References Cited in the Action

In addition to the references applied in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention, as now recited in claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22-27 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by any of the other references cited in the Office Action, either taken alone or in combination.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD &
VILLANUEVA, P.C.

/Robert E. Stachler II/

Robert E. Stachler II, Reg. No. 36,934

Customer No. 76878

Gardner Groff Greenwald & Villanueva, P.C.
2018 Powers Ferry Road, Ste. 800
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: (770) 984-2300
Fax: (770) 984-0098